

REMARKS

Claims 17, 20, 22, and 23 are amended, no additional claims are canceled in this response, and claims 31-33 are added; as a result, claims 17-25 and 31-33 are now pending in this application.

No new matter has been added through the proposed amendments to claims 17, 20, 22, and 23. Support for the proposed amendments to claims 17, 20, 22, and 23 can be found throughout the specification, for example but not limited to the specification at page 8, paragraph 0040 through page 12, paragraph 0054.

No new matter has been added through proposed new claims 31-33. Support for proposed new claims 31-33 can be found throughout the specification, for example but not limited to the specification in the paragraphs as noted above and in FIGs. 8, 9, 12, 13, 16, and 18 as originally filed.

Submission of claim amendments after final rejection - 37 CFR 1.116

Amendments proposed to claims 17, 20, 22, and 23 are admissible because 37 C.F.R. § 1.116(b)(2) states,

(b) After a final rejection or other final action (§ 1.113) in an application or in an ex parte reexamination filed under § 1.510, or an action closing prosecution (§ 1.949) in an inter partes reexamination filed under § 1.913, but before or on the same date of filing an appeal (§ 41.31 or § 41.61 of this title):

(2) An amendment presenting rejected claims in better form for consideration on appeal may be admitted;

Applicants respectfully submit that these proposed amendments to claims 17, 20, 22, and 23 present these claims in a better form for consideration on appeal, and thus may be admitted.

Applicants respectfully request that these proposed amendments to claims 17, 20, 22, and 23, along with proposed new claims 31-33, be entered. In addition, Applicants respectfully request that the proposed amendments be considered in view of granting an allowance of all claims now pending in the application.

§102 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 17-25 (Tsai)

Claims 17-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Tsai (U.S. 5,443,591). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 17-25 based on Tsai.

Claims 17-25 are not anticipated by Tsai because Tsai fails to disclose the subject matter included in claims 17-25 as arranged in claims 17-25. For example, independent claim 17 as now amended includes:

forming at least one groove in a socket housing
contiguous to and in the same plane as a surface mount
region for an electrical device; and
securing a rigid bar within the at least one groove
to thereby ensure that the surface mount region is flat and
remains flat, wherein no portion of the rigid bar extends
outside the at least one groove.

In contrast to independent claim 17, Tsai concerns holding bulges 32, dome shape groove 34, and a shaft 76, wherein Tsai states:¹

Referring to FIGS. 4, 12, 13 for an engaging mechanism,
two holding bulges 32 are formed at one end of base frame 12 each
having a dome shape groove 34 to house a shaft 76 of fan
operating lever 16; operating lever 16 has a handle 78 being
formed as an integral part of shaft 76 and is perpendicular to shaft
76; an eccentric shaft 80 is formed in the middle portion of shaft 76
and a retaining stud 82 is formed on shaft 76 nearby of handle 78
and can engage with a retaining recess 35 on a dome shape groove
34, such that operating lever 16 will be prevented from axial
movement when shaft 76 is turning in dome shape groove 34.

Thus, Tsai describes a shaft 76 in dome shaped grooves and a shaft having an eccentric 80, which as shown in FIG. 4 of Tsai is outside the dome shaped grooves, and the shaft 76 further including a handle 78 being formed as an integral part of shaft 76, wherein handle 78 is also outside of dome shaped grooves 34.

¹ See Tsai at column 4, lines 21-32.

However, there is no teaching in Tsai of, "securing a rigid bar **within the at least one groove** to thereby ensure that the surface mount region is flat and remains flat, **wherein no portion of the rigid bar extends outside the at least one groove**," as required by independent claim 17.

In further examples of subject matter included in claims 17-25 and not taught by Tsai:

Independent claim 20 as now amended includes,

forming a pair of grooves in a socket housing contiguous to a surface mount region for an electrical device, and **inserting a single and separate rigid warpage reinforcement bar** within each of the pair of grooves to thereby ensure the surface mount region is flat and remains flat. (Emphasis added).

Independent claim 23 as now amended includes,

forming a U-shaped groove a socket housing contiguous to **three sides** of a surface mount region for an electrical device, and securing a U-shaped rigid warpage reinforcement bar in **the three sides** in a mating relationship in the U-shaped groove to provide a surface mount region for an electrical device within the U-shape of the U-shaped bar in the U-shaped groove to thereby ensure that the surface mount region is flat and remains flat. (Emphasis added).

In contrast to independent claim 20, there is no teaching in Tsai of, "**inserting a single and separate rigid warpage reinforcement bar within each of the pair of grooves** to thereby ensure the surface mount region is flat and remains flat," as required by independent claim 20. (Emphasis added).

Further and in contrast to independent claim 23, there is no teaching in Tsai of, "securing a U-shaped rigid warpage reinforcement bar **in the three sides** in a mating relationship in the U-shaped groove," as required by independent claim 23. (Emphasis added).

For at least the reasons stated above, Tsai fails to teach all of the subject matter included in independent claims 17, 20, and 23, and so independent claims 17, 20, and 23 are not anticipated by Tsai. Claims 18-19, 21-22, and 24-25 depend from one of independent claims 17, 20, and 23, and so include all of the subject matter included in the independent claims from which they depend, and more. Therefore, Tsai fails to teach all of the subject matter included in

claims 18-19, 21-22, and 24-25, and so claims 18-19, 21-22, and 24-25 are not anticipated by Tsai.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdraw of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) based on Tsai, and allowance of all claims now pending in the application.

Claims 17-25 (Lai et al.)

Claims 17-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Lai et al. (U.S. 5,722,848). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 17-25 based on Lai et al.

Claims 17-25 are not anticipated by Lai et al. because Lai et al. fails to disclose the subject matter included in claims 17-25 as arranged in claims 17-25. The Office Action relies on Fig. 2 and Fig. 4 in Lai et al. in the rejection of claims 17-25. However and in contrast to claims 17-25, Lai et al. with respect to FIG. 2 states:²

As shown in FIG. 2, the first type is that an additional restraint bar 11 extends laterally and horizontally between two piers 12 extending rearward from the rear surface of the base 5, and the cover 3 forms a receiving slot 13 on the rear side for receiving such corresponding restraint bar 11 therein wherein the slot 13 comprises a sufficient depth for allowing the restraint bar 13 to move within the slot 13 in a front-to-end direction without leaving the slot 13, when the cover 3 is slidably moved in the front-to-end direction with regard to the base 5 during rotation of the lever.

With respect to FIG. 4, Lai et al. states:³

A lever 44 includes an actuation handle 46 and a cam shaft 48 wherein the handle 46 is positioned exposed beside one side wall 42 of the cover 28, and the cam shaft 48 is embedded within a channel generally formed by two half channels 50 respectively defined by the cover 28 and the base 22.

Applicants submit that neither of these portions of Lai et al., or any other portion of Lai et al., teaches the subject matter included in independent claims 17, 20, and 23 as described above.

² See Lai et al. at column 2, lines 12-23.

³ See Lai et al. at column 4, lines 49-54.

For example, there is no teaching in Lai et al. of, "securing a rigid bar within the at least one groove to thereby ensure that the surface mount region is flat and remains flat, **wherein no portion of the rigid bar extends outside the at least one groove,**" as required by independent claim 17. (Emphasis added).

Further, there is no teaching in Lai et al. of, "inserting **a single and separate rigid warpage reinforcement bar within each of the pair of grooves** to thereby ensure the surface mount region is flat and remains flat, as required by independent claims 20. (Emphasis added).

Still further, there is no teaching in Lai et al. of, "forming a U-shaped groove a socket housing contiguous **to three sides of** a surface mount region for an electrical device," and no teaching of, "securing a U-shaped rigid warpage reinforcement bar in **the three sides in** a mating relationship in the U-shaped groove," all as required by independent claim 23. (Emphasis added in all instances).

For at least the reasons stated above, Lai et al. fails to teach all of the subject matter included in independent claims 17, 20, and 23, and so independent claims 17, 20, and 23 are not anticipated by Lai et al. Claims 18-19, 21-22, and 24-25 depend from one of independent claims 17, 20, and 23, and so include all of the subject matter included in the independent claims from which they depend, and more. Therefore, Lai et al. fails to teach all of the subject matter included in claims 18-19, 21-22, and 24-25, and so claims 18-19, 21-22, and 24-25 are not anticipated by Lai et al.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdraw of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) based on Lai et al., and allowance of all claims now pending in the application.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicants' attorney at (612) 373-6970 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

TIM A. RENFRO ET AL.

By their Representatives,
SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.
Attorneys for Intel Corporation
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402
(612) 373-6970

Date FEBRUARY 12/2006

By Robert B. Madden
Robert B. Madden
Reg. No. 57,521

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being filed using the USPTO's electronic filing system EFS-Web, and is addressed to: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this 12th day of February 2007.

Amy Moriarty
Name

[Signature]
Signature